

Appl. No. 09/756,805

Amdt. Dated 10/21/2005

Response to Office action dated 04/21/2005

REMARKS

Claims 2, 5, 8 and 11 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are pending.

Disclaimers Relating to Claim Interpretation and Prosecution History Estoppel

Claims 2, 5, 8 and 11 have been amended notwithstanding the belief that these claims were allowable. Except as specifically admitted below, no claim elements have been narrowed. Rather, cosmetic amendments have been made to the claims and to broaden them in view of the cited art. Claims 2, 5, 8 and 11 have been amended solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process, and the amendments were not necessary for patentability.

Any reference herein to "the invention" is intended to refer to the specific claim or claims being addressed herein. The claims of this Application are intended to stand on their own and are not to be read in light of the prosecution history of any related or unrelated patent or patent application. Furthermore, no arguments in any prosecution history relate to any claim in this Application, except for arguments specifically directed to the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by Uchino et al. (USP 6,865,715). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Uchino is directed to searching for a document within a group of documents posted to a conference room on the Internet or the like, the search based on user-specified search terms.

Claim 2 is independent. Claim 2 recites, among other features:

the second database is searched by using the notable word as a keyword when the message text includes a notable word in the notable words collection, and if no record including the notable word exist in the second database, then the message text is posted on the bulletin board.

Appl. No. 09/756,805

Amdt. Dated 10/21/2005

Response to Office action dated 04/21/2005

The Examiner asserted that Uchino discloses this feature because it "searches a database for the extracted word, if the word is not in database, it is added and message continues procession onto bulletin board." (Uchino, 7:3 – 8:36, 11:17-58, 15:48 – 16:8 and 18:49-67). The cited portion of Uchino is directed to organizing a group of documents by title (Uchino, 7:57-59), extracting a keyword from the documents (Uchino, 7:67 – 8:1) and indexing the documents by the keyword (Uchino, 8:8-12). Based on the indexing, a user may search from among the group of documents by a "user-specified" word as a keyword (Uchino, 7:18-23).

However, Uchino does not disclose this limitation. Uchino discloses searching a plurality of documents by a "user-specified" search term, not a "notable word" common to a message text posting and a first database. The "notable word" is stored in the first database. If the message text posting includes a "notable word" common to the first database, then records stored in the second database are searched based on the notable word. Since Uchino searches a plurality of documents based on a user-specified search term, not a "notable word" common to a message text posting and a first database, Uchino does not anticipate claim 2.

Claim 2 recites, among other features:

when a record including the notable word exists as a result of searching the second database, the word in the message text is converted into a hypertext format having a URL generated properly to which the word is linked as a link destination, and the message text is posted on the bulletin board, the URL being so described as to constitute a start instruction to a search report program, which reports a result of searching the second database by using the notable word as a keyword.

The Examiner asserted that Uchino discloses this feature because "keywords are converted into HTML for linking other related document threads by the URL, which will display the results and threads of the other bulletin board messages with the keyboard." (Uchino, 1:32-58, 12:18 – 13:59, 14:58 – 15:17 and 16:5-67).

However, Uchino does not disclose this limitation either. Uchino discloses providing a URL for a keyword linking a user to a specific document within a display list, not providing a URL that

Appl. No. 09/756,805

Amdt. Dated 10/21/2005

Response to Office action dated 04/21/2005

"constitutes a start instruction to a search report program, which reports a result of searching the second database by using the notable word as a keyword". The cited portions of Uchino are directed to listing a group of documents having the "user-selected" term. In each record of Uchino's listing, a URL is provided for the "user-selected" search term. Uchino's keyword has a URL linking a user to a specific document within the displayed list. Since Uchino's URL does not disclose a start instruction to search report program, Uchino does not anticipate claim 2.

Independent claims 5, 8 and 11 have similar limitations as claim 2 and are therefore patentable over Uchino for the same reasons as set forth in the argument for claim 2. Claims 3, 6, 9 and 12 are patentable over Uchino by virtue of their respective dependence from claims 2, 5, 8 and 11.

Conclusion

It is submitted, however, that the independent and dependent claims include other significant and substantial recitations which are not disclosed in the cited references. Thus, the claims are also patentable for additional reasons. However, for economy the additional grounds for patentability are not set forth here.

In view of all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested and allowance at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to answer any questions or to discuss steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 21, 2005


Joel G. Landau, Reg. No. 54,732

9/10

Appl. No. 09/756,805

Amdt. Dated 10/21/2005

Response to Office action dated 04/21/2005

SoCal IP Law Group LLP
310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: 805/230-1350
Facsimile: 805/230-1355
email: info@socalip.com